

REMARKS

After entry of this amendment, claims 2-5, 7, 10, 12-26, 29-32 and 34-58 will be pending.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for having no antecedent basis for the term “broad-stripe”. The term in question has been amended to recite “broad-stripe laser diode”. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3.

Claims 1-9, 13-25, 27-31, 33 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,905,252) in view of Braiman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,016). As the claims in question have either been canceled or amended to depend from an allowable claim, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the noted allowability of claims 10-11, 32 and 34 if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As claims 10, 32 and 34 have been rewritten to include the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 26, Applicants note that on page 7 of the Office Action, under the section titled “Allowable Subject Matter”, this claim and claim 32 are referred to as containing allowable subject matter, i.e., having a lateral spacing equivalent to at least one half of a fundamental mode diameter associated with the external resonator cavity multiplied by a factor by which the output beam divergence exceeds the diffraction limit. Accordingly claim 26 has been amended to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and as such, is believed to be in condition for allowance.


Except for their dependency, new claims 36-56 are identical to original claims 2-9, 12-23 except that they depend from allowable claims. Similarly, new claims 57 and 58 are identical to original claims 29 and 35 except that they depend from allowable claims. As claims 36-58 do not add new matter, Applicants respectfully request their allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (415) 889-5700.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

December 21, 2005
Date



David Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37776

Patent Law Office of David G. Beck
P.O. Box 1146
Mill Valley, CA 94942
Tel. 415-889-5700
Fax 415-889-5706